R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 175 JC 670 071

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE DEAN'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR.

BY- CARSON, J. O. SCHULTZ, RAYMOND E.

PUB DATE 64

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.44 11P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, *ADMINISTRATOR ATTITUDES, *LEADERSHIP QUALITIES, BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE,

PRESIDENTS, DEPARTMENT HEADS, AND STUDENT LEADERS FROM 20 PUBLIC 2-YEAR COLLEGES FILLED OUT A QUESTIONNAIRE WHICH INDICATED THEIR PERCEPTIONS OF AND EXPECTATIONS FOR THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF THEIR DEANS. THE DEANS THEMSELVES DESCRIBED WHAT THEY THOUGHT TO BE THEIR OWN BEHAVIOR. THE LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE DEVELOPED BY THE PERSONNEL RESEARCH BOARD AT OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY WAS THE FORM EMPLOYED. THE LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR OF DEANS WAS FREQUENTLY PERCEIVED BY PRESIDENTS DIFFERENTLY FROM THE WAY IT WAS PERCEIVED BY STUDENT LEADERS. THIS DISCREPANCY POINTED TO ROLE CONFLICTS FOR THE DEANS. BOTH THE STUDENT LEADERS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS EXPECTED MORE LEADERSHIP QUALITIES THAN THEY PERCEIVED IN THE DEANS, POINTING TO THE NEED FOR GREATER COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THESE GROUPS. THIS ARTICLE WAS PUBLISHED IN "THE JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL EDUCATION," VOLUME 32, NUMBER 4, SUMMER 1964. (AD)

ED012175

THE JOURNAL OF EXPERIMENTAL EDUCATION
(Volume 32, Number 4, Summer 1964)

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 13 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE DEAN'S LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR

J. O. CARSON, Jr.
RAYMOND E. SCHULTZ
Florida State University

THIS IS A report of an investigation designed to study the leadership behavior of the junior college dean. The perceptions and expectations of his leadership behavior as viewed by student leaders were compared with those of the president, department heads, and the dean himself. Attention was also given to identifying possible role conflicts encountered by the dean in his intermediate position between the president and department heads on the one hand and between students and these members of the professional staff on the other.

The primary purpose of this study was to discover whether or not students' perceptions and expectations of leadership behavior on the part of the dean introduce into the administrative situation the need for leadership role different from that demanded by relationships with the professional staff. Stated in question form, do student leaders perceive and expect a type of leadership behavior from the dean different than that expected by the president and department heads?

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Early research and theory formulation in this area was directed toward a unitary trait theory of leadership. Principle postulates of this theory were: 1) that there exists a "leadership trait" which is innate or inherent; 2) that leaders alone possess it; 3) that individuals vary in the degree to which they possess it; and 4) the trait, when possessed, functions with equal force in a variety of situations. The theory implied that the trait could be identified and measured. To date, however, no such trait has been identified. For a review of the literature and research on this topic see Gibb (4).

More recent efforts at research have focused on "leadership behavior" [1] as differentiated from "leadership". The focus here is on behavior rather than presumed underlying capacity. This approach involves describing and measuring behavior of the leader and emphasizes the how rather than the what of administrative behavior. This how aspect relates to the interpersonal relationships between a leader – dean in this case – and those with whom he is involved in his administrative role, in this case the president, department heads, and students. Assessing leadership behavior involves obtaining evidence on the perceptions and expectations that associates have of the leader rather than focusing entirely on what he does.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument employed for this study was the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire devised by the Personnel Research Board at Ohio State University. It is hereafter referred to as the LBD Questionnaire. This instrument was chosen because it incorporates two significant dimensions of leader behavior, "Initiation of Structure" and "Consideration" – both of which have been identified as primary in analysis of the executive function. The LBD Questionnaire is composed of forty items of which only fifteen are scored for each of the two dimensions. Items are short descriptive statements of ways in which leaders behave. Responses consist of checking one of the following: "always", "often", "occasionally", "seldom", or "never" for each item. Each item is scored on a 4 to 0 scale with a theoretical range of scores for each dimension ranging from 0 to 60. The estimated split-half method, when corrected for attenuation, for the Initiating Structure score is .83 when applied in terms of the desired or "Ideal" behavior. For the Consideration score the reliability is .92 for the perceived of "Real" behavior and .66 for the desired or "Ideal" behavior (6). Getzels and Guba identified the terms "nomothetic" and "idiographic" for for these two dimensions (3). The former, or the Initiation of Structure dimension, is described by them as emphasizing institution or group through the establishment of patterns of organization, channels of communication, and the assignment of individuals to tasks. The "idiographic" or Consideration dimension delineates behavior indicative of

JC 670 071

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Wilson Thiede for Dembar Educational Services TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

EXECUTIVE EDITORS

John Schmid, Professor of Education and Chairman of the Department of Educational Foundations, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas. *Chairman.*

Philip Lambert, Professor of Educational Psychology and Educational Administration, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

L. Joseph Lins, Professor and Coordinator of Institutional Studies, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

CONSULTING EDITORS

Terms Expire December 31, 1964

Jacob O. Bach, Head, Education Research Bureau, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.

R. O. Collier, Professor of Educational Psychology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.

Robert A. Davis, Professor of Educational Research, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee.

John C. Flanagan, President, American Institute for Research, 410 Amberson Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

T. E. Newland, Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

Louis G. Schmidt, Chairman, Department of Psychology, Orange County State College, Fullerton, California.

Maurice E. Troyer, Director of Values Study, International Christian University, Mitaka, Tokyo, Japan.

D. A. Worcester, Visiting Professor of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona.

Terms Expire December 31, 1965

Emmett A. Betts, Research Professor, School of Education, University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida.

Herbert S Conrad, Program Development Officer, Educational Research and Development, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

Harl R. Douglass, Director Emeritus of College of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

Carter V. Good, Dean, College of Education and Home Economics, Teachers College, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Valworth R. Plumb, Chairman, Division of Education and Psychology, University of Minnesota, Duluth, Minnesota.

Helen Thompson, Associate Professor of Educational Psychology, Director, Thompson Reading Clinic, Chapman College, Orange, California.

Paul A. Witty, Professor of Education, Director of Psycho-Educational Clinic, School of Education, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

J. Wayne Wrightstone, Assistant Superintendent, Board of Education of the City of New York, 110 Livingston Street, Brooklyn, New York.

Terms Expire December 31, 1966

Harold D. Carter, Professor of Education, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Stephen M. Corey, Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

Harold A. Edgerton, President, Performance Research, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C.

D. Welty Lefever, Professor of Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.

H. H. Remmers, Professor of Educational Psychology, Director Division Educational Reference, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

Robert L. Thorndike, Chairman, Department of Psychological Foundations and Services, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, New York.

Ernest R. Wood, Dean of the Faculty, Frederick College, Portsmouth, Virginia.

The Journal of Experimental Education is published at Madison, Wisconsin, four times a year. Price $10 a year, $3 a copy. Second class postage paid at Madison, Wisconsin. Copyright 1964 by Dembar Educational Research Services, Inc. Address all business correspondence care of DERS, Box 1605, Madison, Wisconsin 53701. Send all manuscripts to Prof. John Schmid, College of Education, The University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

Published by DEMBAR EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH SERVICES, Inc. WALTER FRAUTSCHI, President. Prof. WILSON B. THIEDE, Vice President and Publisher. Prof. CLARENCE A. SCHOENFELD, Assistant to the Publisher. ARNOLD CAUCUTT, Treasurer and Business Manager. JEAN WILLIAMS POTTER, Supervisor of Editorial Services.

friendship, mutual trust, respect and warmth in relationships between the leader and members of the group or institution.

These two dimensions are viewed as constituting styles of leadership. Effective administrative leadership appears to require that they be blended in the behavior of the administrator. The way in which they need to be blended seems to be governed by the situation and perceptions of those affected by the administrator's actions. The task of the administrator then is to serve at the same time the needs of the institution and of individuals in such a way as to make the institution or organization both organizationally productive and individually fulfilling.

The questionnaire affords a means of viewing these two behavior dimensions as two coordinates with respect to which a leader's behavior can be described. Stated differently, it permits quantifying leader behavior on two relevant variables. It has been determined by factoral analysis that the two dimensions of Initiating Structure and Consideration account for approximately 50 and 34 percent, respectively, of the common variance (7).

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Several research studies have been reported in which the LBD Questionnaire was employed. Among these was the study of leadership behavior by Evenson (1). He reports that within each of forty schools teachers agreed among themselves in describing the behavior of the principal on both the Initiating Structure and Consideration Dimensions.

Evenson further found that superintendents' perceptions of principals on the dimension Initiating Structure agreed with the teachers' to a degree that was statistically significant. No significant relationship was found, however, between the principal's assessment of his own leadership behavior and the assessments by teachers and superintendents.

Halpin reports several studies in which the LBD Questionnaire was employed. One compared the leadership behavior of combat airplane commanders as judged by the crews with the judgment of pilots' performances by superiors (5). For both combat and training situations there was a trend toward a negative correlation between superiors' ratings and the Consideration dimension while between superiors' ratings and the dimension Initiating Structure there was a positive correlation. Correlations between these dimensions and crewmen's satisfaction were in the opposite direction.

Another study by Halpin compared the superintendent's self-perception with the perceptions held of him by members of the board and the staff (8). It was found that the board and staff members each tended to agree among themselves but not with the other group. Members of the staff saw the superintendent as showing less Considerations than did the board members or than the superintendent saw in himself. Conversely, the board rated the superintendent higher on Initiating Structure than did the staff – or than the superintendent rated himself.

Hemphill employed the LBD Questionnaire to study the relationship between characteristics of a college department and the reputation of the department (9). No significant correlations were found between thirteen departmental characteristics and the department's reputation. It was found, however, that if the chairman met faculty expectations on both Consideration and Initiating Structure, the department was more likely to achieve a favorable reputation.

In summary, the research indicates that obtaining an accurate picture of an administrator's leadership behavior necessitates securing information from the various groups with whom he associates. Furthermore, it appears that the administrator is likely not to be seen in the same light by these various groups. However, research has been reported on students' perceptions of administrators or how their perceptions compare with those of the professional staff. The primary purpose of this investigation was to explore that area.

THE SAMPLE AND PROCEDURE

The sample for this study was drawn from twenty public two-year colleges which met one or more of the following criteria. They were 1) members of the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, 2) accredited by the State Department of Education or, 3) approved by the public universities in the state in which located. Other criteria for selections were 1) enrollments of between 200 and 750 students, and 2) both the president and dean having had at least two years of tenure in their positions. Department heads of participating institutions had to have been on the faculty for at least two years and student leaders were limited to those who were enrolled in their second year at the junior college.

Each participant was instructed to complete the LBD Questionnaire from the two frames of reference previously described. First, he responded on the basis of how he perceived the dean, which provided what is hereafter referred to as the "Real" score. Next, he responded on the basis of how he would like the dean to act which provided what is hereafter referred to as the "Ideal" score. Usable responses were received from 20 deans, 20 presidents, 115 department heads, and 141 student leaders.

NULL HYPOTHESES TESTED

Following are the primary hypotheses which were tested:

1. The between-group variances for ratings "Real"

and "Ideal" of each dimension are not statistically significant.
2. Student ratings "Real" and "Ideal" of the dean on each dimension taken separately do not differ significantly from the comparable ratings respectively of presidents, department heads, and deans.
3. "Real" ratings of the dean on the two dimensions do not differ significantly.
4. "Ideal" ratings of the dean on the two dimensions do not differ significantly.
5. "Real" and "Ideal" ratings of the dean on each dimension do not differ significantly.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Tables 1 and 2 contain the basic data of the study. Student leaders and department heads' ratings appear as means for each institution and are treated as "index" scores. The ratings by presidents and deans represent individual scores for each institution. The Bartlett test of Homogeneity of variance supported the use of student leaders' and department heads' mean scores.

It will be noted from Table 1 that ranges of "Real" i.e., perceived behavior, scores for the four referent groups is between 15 and 27 with those of department heads being the most restricted. Ranges of the "Ideal", i.e., expected behavior, scores were considerably more constricted for student leaders and deans than were ranges of their scores on the "Real" scores. (Table 2) This was also true for presidents on the "Consideration" dimension. Ranges of the deans' scores were virtually identical on perceived and expected behavior as was the presidents' range on the dimension, "Initiating Structure".

Between Group Variance

An analysis of variance test was made for each dimension of perceived and expected behavior to determine the significance, if any, between institutions and between the four groups under consideration. In testing hypothesis 1, answers were sought to the questions, a) Do student leaders and department heads from school to school agree as to the perceived and expected behavior of the dean? b) Do student leader perceptions of and expectations for the dean's behavior differ significantly from those of department heads? c) Do the expectations for the dean's leader behavior as viewed by student leaders and department heads create conflicting roles for him?

The F-ratios obtained from this analysis are found in Table 3 (5). Those ratios show that only for the dimension Consideration "Real" did student leaders and department heads in the overall sample view the dean's behavior differently. However, when analyzed by institution, significant F-ratios were obtained for both the "Real" and "Ideal" dimensions. These differences support the theoretical concept underlying this investigation; namely, that styles of leadership behavior and the consequent perception of these styles by various groups is situationally derived.

The significant F-ratio for interaction shown in Table 3, indicates that differences exist which cannot be accounted for by the between rows and columns variance. These differences may be due to extraneous variables or to actual differential effects.

Following the analysis of variance in which significant institutional differences were found, Scheffe's test for differences between means was run for all pairs of means in each analysis. This was done in an effort to determine the characteristics of institutions between which significant differences existed. Using this procedure, no differences were found to be significant. Hence, no distinguishing characteristics could be determined.

Correlations Between Respondents' Ratings

The comparison of student leader ratings of the dean's leadership behavior with those of the presidents and deans required a method of analysis different from the analysis of variance. This is because only a single dean and president participated from each institution. To handle this situation statistically, the mean score for student leaders of an institution was taken as an index value for the group with the same procedure employed for department heads. These index values and the single ratings by presidents and deans were compared by computing rank-difference correlations.

Since these correlations were based upon scores obtained from an instrument of less than perfect reliability, there was a tendency to "deflate" the obtained measures of relationship between the two arrays of scores. To allow for this underestimation of reliability, a correction for attenuation was applied to the obtained scores (2). The correlations obtained are presented in Table 4. They provide a test for Hypothesis 5 by answering the questions, a) Do student leaders' perceptions of an expectation for the dean's behavior differ significantly from those of department heads and president, b) Do these different groups perceive differing styles of leader behavior from the dean? c) Does the dean encounter conflict resulting from the different expectations of the groups with which he must relate?

A significant positive correlation indicates that two groups agreed substantially in their ratings of the dean. Lack of significant correlation indicates slight agreement while a significant negative correlation suggests disagreement. It will be noted from Table 4 that there were no significant correlations of the student leaders and presidents or between de-

TABLE 1

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – "REAL" MEAN ASCRIBED SCORES, RANGE, AND SUBGROUP VARIANCES BY RESPONDENT GROUPS AND INDIVIDUAL SCORES BY PRESIDENTS AND DEANS

Institution	Student Leaders					Department Heads					Presidents		Deans	
	Consideration			Initiating Structure		Consideration			Initiating Structure					
	N	M	s^2	M	s^2	N	M	s^2	M	s^2	Con.	I.S.	Con.	I.S.
A	6	45	20	33	150	7	48	59	42	37	51	51	54	45
B	7	46	65	39	108	5	45	48	39	55	46	36	47	36
C	6	41	189	43	211	5	37	42	44	9	41	48	46	39
D	8	37	126	38	46	7	48	20	41	42	54	54	49	46
E	7	46	37	43	57	6	46	61	42	138	30	40	41	35
F	9	34	98	38	83	7	48	20	39	108	50	39	49	39
G	10	47	21	44	66	6	48	12	45	60	48	47	55	50
H	8	47	39	42	39	5	50	9	37	54	52	50	56	43
I	8	44	89	40	86	5	49	44	44	74	45	41	39	38
J	10	41	66	44	13	6	46	37	43	63	40	40	47	35
K	5	47	32	46	45	7	54	27	48	27	53	55	54	47
L	8	52	19	48	49	7	50	38	42	47	45	52	52	45
M	7	37	53	33	92	4	44	103	34	101	51	39	45	43
N	4	39	75	28	77	3	49	7	38	46	50	45	44	41
O	6	51	30	46	44	6	50	35	43	113	45	41	49	49
P	4	43	47	38	181	5	48	52	38	88	57	51	49	38
Q	6	42	27	44	40	6	39	79	39	179	54	54	51	53
R	6	46	8	47	19	7	47	18	41	55	49	44	46	46
S	8	37	138	39	119	6	38	77	41	86	44	46	32	39
T	8	47	34	37	49	5	48	39	37	76	47	42	54	39
Mean		43.45		40.9			46.6		40.85		47.6	45.75	47.95	41.85
Range		34-52		28-48			37-54		34-48		30-57	36-55	32-56	30-53

Means and variances rounded off to nearest integer for reporting in this table
N = number M = means S^2 = variances

TABLE 2

LEADER BEHAVIOR DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – "IDEAL" MEAN ASCRIBED SCORES, RANGE, AND SUBGROUP VARIANCE BY RESPONDENT GROUPS AND INDIVIDUAL SCORES BY PRESIDENTS AND DEANS

Institutions	Student Leaders					Department Heads					Presidents		Deans	
	Consideration			Initiating Structure		Consideration			Initiating Structure					
	N	M	s^2	M	s^2	N	M	s^2	M	s^2	Con.	I.S.	Con.	I.S.
A	6	49	16	38	119	7	48	21	48	76	50	52	54	49
B	7	45	53	46	31	5	47	13	44	77	43	42	43	34
C	6	55	12	48	73	5	49	39	46	24	49	51	48	42
D	8	50	35	50	11	7	51	18	48	36	56	52	50	53
E	7	50	18	50	12	6	47	27	52	15	45	46	49	50
F	9	49	22	46	24	7	47	20	44	8	51	49	52	45
G	10	49	20	47	97	6	51	11	52	11	53	52	54	56
H	8	50	20	48	36	5	51	7	45	15	54	51	59	50
I	8	50	10	46	70	5	52	16	47	75	47	45	48	41
J	10	51	14	47	38	6	50	11	49	33	42	41	53	44
K	5	51	29	50	22	7	55	18	54	6	60	60	56	51
L	8	53	20	48	29	7	49	23	45	91	49	53	56	52
M	7	47	30	43	65	4	52	7	50	25	45	45	51	54
N	4	52	17	37	168	3	47	17	47	83	57	45	52	48
O	6	55	22	53	29	6	50	29	50	44	47	46	52	58
P	4	49	22	47	11	5	51	24	46	12	56	52	54	44
Q	6	48	61	48	44	6	46	19	50	14	52	56	52	55
R	6	46	30	49	43	7	48	22	48	55	53	51	42	42
S	8	46	24	46	34	6	47	41	49	53	51	47	37	37
T	8	50	12	39	57	5	49	32	43	39	46	52	52	43
Mean		49.75		46.3			49.9		47.8		50.3	49.4	50.7	47.45
Range		45-55		37-53			46-55		43-54		42-60	41-60	37-59	34-58

Means and variances rounded off to nearest integer for reporting in this table
N = number M = mean S^2 = variance

partment heads and presidents whereas three of the four correlations between student leaders and department heads and between student leaders and deans were significant.

Comparisons of Mean Ratings

Table 5 presents results obtained when mean ratings are compared and provides the data for testing Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5. A significant t-value suggests that an actual difference exists between the two mean scores that are compared. The data in Table 5 serves to answer two questions, a) Do students, or the other groups, perceive and/or expect the dean to stress one dimension more than the other? and b) Do student leaders, or the other groups, expect more of a given dimension than they perceive. Question a is answered by Items 1 and 2 of Table 5 whereas Question b is answered by Items 3 and 4 or Table 5.

It will be observed that sudents perceived about the same amount of both dimensions but expected significantly more of the Consideration dimension than of the Initiating Structure dimension. Department heads perceived more of Consideration than of the Initiating Structure dimension, and deans perceived more of the former but did not appear to consider it more important. With respect as to how each dimension was perceived in relation to what was expected (Question b), it will be noted that both student leaders and department heads expected significantly more on both dimensions than they perceived and that deans expected more in the way of Initiating Structure than they perceived.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

1. Student leaders within a school agreed among themselves, with reference to the perceived and expected behavior of the dean on the dimensions, Consideration and Initiating Structure based on the Bartlett Test Homogeneity of Variance.
2. Student leaders and department heads taken together from school to school do not agree in their perceptions of nor their expectations of the leadership behavior of the dean of either dimension of leadership behavior. (See Table 3.)
3. Student leaders disagreed with presidents in their perceptions and expectations on both dimensions. (See Table 4.)
4. Student leaders and deans agreed in their perceptions and expectations of the dean's behavior on the dimension Consideration and on their perceptions of the dean on the dimension Initiating Structure. (See Table 4.)
5. Student leaders and department heads taken as groups, agreed on their perceptions and expectations of the dean's behavior on the dimension Initiating Structure and on their expectation of the dean's behavior on the dimension Consideration. (Table 4.)
6. Student leaders and presidents perceived the two dimensions to be about equally present in the dean's behavior, whereas department heads and deans perceived significantly more Consideration than Initiating Structure. (See Table 5.)
7. Student leaders expected significantly more Consideration than Initiating Structure, while presidents, deans, and department heads expected both dimensions to be about equally present in the dean's behavior. (See Table 5.)
8. Student leaders and department heads expected significantly more Consideration than they perceived in the dean's behavior whereas deans and presidents both seemed to perceive and expect this dimension in about the same degree. (See Table 5.)
9. Student leaders, as well as all other referent groups, excepting presidents, expected significantly more Initiating Structure on the part of the dean than they perceived. (Table 5.)

CONCLUSION

The results of this investigation indicate that student leaders constitute a reference group to which the junior collge dean should attempt to relate in creating an effective and efficient climate for the accomplishment of the institution's purposes. Evidence was obtained that discrepancies of perceptions and expectations exist between student leaders and the other referent groups, especially presidents.

These discrepancies suggest that role conflicts exist for the dean. The discrepancies between the expectations of the president on the one hand, and those of student leaders on the other, appear to produce the dean's major role conflict.

Inasmuch as both student leaders and department heads expected significantly more Consideration and Initiating Structure than they perceived, the dean apparently needs to stress both kinds of behavior more in his relations with these two groups.

FOOTNOTE

1. Some use the term "leader behavior" rather than "leadership behavior". This is the case with the instrument employed for this investigation.

REFERENCES

1. Evenson, Warren L., "Leadership Behavior of High School Principals", National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, XLIII, Part II (September, 1959), p. 98.
2. Garrett, Henry C., Statistics in Psychology and Education, 5th edition (New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1958), p. 358.
3. Getzels, J. W. and Guba, E. G., "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process", School Review LXV (Winter, 1957), p. 429.

4. Gibb, Cecil A., "Leadership", Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. II ed. Gardner Lindzey (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1954), p. 913.
5. Halpin, Andrew W., "The Leadership Behavior and Combat Performance of Airplane Commanders", The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLIX (1954), p. 21.
6. Halpin, Andrew W., "The Leader Behavior and Leadership Ideology of Educational Administrators and Aircraft Commanders", Harvard Educational Review, XXV (Winter, 1955), p. 20.
7. Halpin, Andrew W., The Manual of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (Columbus, Ohio: The Bureau of Business Research, Ohio State University, 1957), p. 1.
8. Halpin, Andrew W., The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents (Chicago: Midwest Administrative Center, University of Chicago, 1959), pp. 75-78.
9. Hemphill, John K., "Leadership Behavior Associated with the Administrative Reputation of College Departments", Journal of Educational Psychology, XLVI (November, 1955), p. 399.

TABLE 3

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE BETWEEN REFERENCE GROUPS AND BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS BY DIMENSION, "REAL" AND "IDEAL"

Source of Variation	df	Real		Ideal	
		Consideration F	Initiating Structure F	Consideration F	Initiating Structure F
Between Reference Groups	1 216	13.509*	less than unity	less than unity	3.857
Between Institutions	19 216	2.825*	2.691*	2.316*	2.586*
Interaction	19 216	2.242*	2.139*	less than	1.142

F-ratios required for significance at df = 1 and 216, P.01, $F > 6.754$

F-ratios required for significance at df = 19 and 216, P .01, $F > 2.041$

*Significant at P .01

TABLE 4

RANK-DIFFERENCE CORRELATIONS[1] BETWEEN RESPONDENT GROUPS BY DIMENSION, "REAL" AND "IDEAL"

	Real		Ideal	
	Consid-eration r	Initiating Structure r	Consid-eration r	Initiating Structure r
Student Leaders vs. Presidents	-.13	.26	.06	.32
Student Leaders vs. Department Heads	-.13	.73*	.80*	.64*
Student Leaders vs. Deans	.60*	.42	.59*	.59*
Department Heads vs. Presidents	.29	.22	.48	.14
Department Heads vs. Deans	.53	.20	.56*	.78*
Presidents vs. Deans	.53	.64*	.52	.54

[1]Coefficients corrected for attenuation
Coefficients required for significance at df = 18, P .01, r = .561
*Significant at P .01

TABLE 5

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEAN RATINGS FOR BOTH DIMENSIONS, "REAL" AND "IDEAL" BY RESPONDENT CATEGORIES[1]

	Student Leaders		Department Heads		Presidents		Deans	
	Mean	t	Mean	t	Mean	t	Mean	t
1. Consideration-Real vs.	43.45		46.6		47.6		48.0	
Initiating Structure-Real	40.50	1.86	40.9	4.75*	45.8	.942	41.9	3.28*
2. Consideration-Ideal vs.	49.75		49.9		50.7		50.7	
Initiating Structure-Ideal	46.30	3.38*	47.8	2.36	49.4	.592	47.5	1.71
3. Consideration-Real vs.	43.45		46.6		47.6		48.0	
Consideration-Ideal	49.75	-5.08*	49.9	-2.97*	50.3	-1.53	50.7	-1.53
4. Initiating Structure-Real vs.	40.50		40.9		45.8		41.9	
Initiating Structure-Ideal	46.30	-4.06*	47.8	-6.97*	49.4	12.13	47.5	-2.86*

t-value required for significance at df = 38, P .05, t = 2.024. P .01, t = 2.714
*Significant at P .01
[1]The formula for standard deviation when two small independent samples are pooled was used.